

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/598,890

Applicant(s)

BERNDT, MANFRED

Examiner

Brian R. Gordon

Art Unit

1743

All Participants:(1) Brian R. Gordon.(2) Roseanna Kaplan.**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 October 2004**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Claim 56

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner attempted to call the attorney of record Allan Lowe, from 10-19-04 to 10-22-04. A message was left on the first attempt. Mr. Lowe failed to respond to message by 10-22-04. The examiner called once again on 10-22-04. Eventually the examiner spoke to Ms. Kaplan, an IP Specialist, and the examiner explained applicant had filed a second after-final amendment in which applicant made a bonified effort to amend the claims for allowance, however the amendment of claim 56 further required some cosmetic changes for clarity such as amending the preamble. The suggested claim was given as: A combination of a supply element and a laboratory microchip with a microfluidic structure, the microchip comprising a substance supplier; the supply element comprising at least one substance-containing supplier including a substance; wherein the microchip substance supplier is adapted to be connected in flow relation with the substance-containing supplier of the supply element; said at least one substance-containing supplier having a substance seal for maintaining the substance therein in the substance-containing supplier; the substance-containing supplier and seal thereof having a size, position, material and shape for causing the seal thereof to be opened to the microchip in response to the supply element and the microchip being joined together and for enabling said substance to be transferred from said at least one substance-containing supplier to said substance supplier disposed within the microchip, the substance-containing supplier in the supply element being different from the substance supplier in the microchip. Ms. Kaplan informed the examiner that the proposed claim had been presented to Mr. Randy Noranbrock and he responded by stating it would not be possible to approve the claim without clients approval as such a written action (advisory) is requested.